



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,359	12/30/2003	Valery M. Dubin	110348-135103	7770
31817	7590	04/06/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 S.W. FIFTH AVE. PORTLAND, OR 97204				QUACH, TUAN N
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2826		

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/748,359	DUBIN ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan Quach	Art Unit 2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

TQ
 Tuan Quach
 Primary Examiner

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Rejection 35 U.S.C. 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe in view of Aoyama or Chen.

Marathe (6,476,498) teaches regarding claim 1, a semiconductor device comprising a substrate 216, a dielectric layer 212/210 over the substrate, a damascene interconnect structure 232/234/236 defined in the dielectric layer, a barrier layer 232 deposited over the dielectric layer and within the damascene interconnect structure, the barrier layer within the damascene interconnect structure being tapered. See column 6 lines 60-68, Fig. 3. Regarding claim 2, the barrier being thinner toward an edge and

Art Unit: 2826

thicker toward the bottom is also shown, e.g., portion 231. Regarding claim 3, the via or trench is shown is shown in the openings in dielectric layer. Regarding claim 5, the different barrier materials Thus Marathe lacks anticipation primarily in that it does not recite the damascene interconnect structure having a bottom portion not coupled to a conductive channel.

Aoyama (5,592,024) teaches formation of interconnect wherein a bottom portion can either contact a lower interconnect trench or does not contact a lower interconnect trench. See e.g., Figs. 11G, 13D, 16, 21, 24E, 25E, 26D, 30, 31L, the corresponding descriptions including column 12, lines 46-49 wherein wiring buried in interlayer insulating film 2 is advantageously obtained for a multilayer structure, column 13 line 13-37 wherein a buried wiring is obtained, column 14 line 62, column 17 lines 20-24 wherein a wiring groove can be obtained without connecting to a lower interconnect trench, column 19 lines 65 to form wiring groove 106, column 20 lines 52 et seq. wherein a wiring groove 128 is formed with the a bottom portion not contacting a lower conductive trench and wiring groove 123 contacting lower conductive trench 124, and column 21 lines 33 et seq. wherein wiring grooves having bottom portion not contacting a conductive trench is also shown.

Chen (6,806,184) teaches opening in dielectric 22 which may an opening created as part of a damascene process and may therefore have the cross section of a singly or a double damascene opening, etched into the surface of the first layer 22 of the dielectric for the creation of an interconnection therein. A single damascene opening

Art Unit: 2826

comprises an interconnect via or an interconnect trench, a double damascene opening comprises an interconnect via and an interconnect trench. See column 3 lines 34-54.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in practicing Marathe to have employed the damascene structure therein having bottom portions over a conductive trench as well as having bottom portion not contacting a conductive trench, since such would permit the desired conventional structures as shown in Aoyama and Chen and permits contact to the lower trench where desired and permits isolation where contact to a lower trench is not necessary, and such would permit both types of interconnect structures to be obtained using the same layers.

The use of cap layer s well known in the art, e.g., as evidenced by Aoyama, cap 7 over the interconnect for providing protection, see, e.g., column 11 line 20 to column 12 line 22 and such provision to protect the interconnect would have been obvious.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe taken with Aoyama or Chen as applied to claims 1-5 and 8 above, and further in view of Farrar.

The references as applied above do not recite all the materials in claim 5, thicknesses in claims 6 and 7, the silicon oxide in claim 8.

Farrar 2002/0024150 teaches the various barrier materials including refractory materials including the selection of appropriate materials, the appropriate thickness for the barrier, and the conventional dielectric such as oxide. See [0051].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have employed the well known alternative barrier materials, to have selected and optimized the appropriate thickness and to have employed silicon oxide as dielectric material, as claimed in these claims since such correspond to well known materials and dimensions as evidenced by Farrar. Official notice is further given regarding well known alternative barrier materials not expressly recited.

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marathe taken with Aoyama or Chen (as applied to claims 1-5 and 8 above), and further in view of Farrar and McCown.

The references are applied as above and does not recite the application for connection to microprocessors as in claim 21. Farrar above is applied as above and further teaches conventional application of damascene interconnect for connecting to microprocessors including the bus 452, the microprocessors. See [0066] and Fig. 24.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art in practicing the above invention to have applied the interconnect in question into microprocessor interconnection since such is conventional and advantageous applications as evidenced by Farrar. Conversely, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have provided in Farrar the tapered barrer as taught by Marathe to obtain the advantages cited, column 5 lines 53-65, including the provision where a bottom portion not contacting a lower conductive trench if desired or where such contact is unnecessary or necessary as evidenced by Aoyama or Chen. It would have been further obvious to provide the connection to a network interface since such is well known and obvious as

Art Unit: 2826

evidenced by McCown 2002/0184490, [0025] wherein microprocessor 200B communicates through device bus 202B and network interface 206B. Regarding claim 22-24, these correspond to claims 2-4, respectively, and would have been obvious for the same reasons as delineated above.

Applicant's arguments filed January 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Marathe discloses damascene structure coupled to a conductive channel and while applicant claims not coupled to a conductive channel. Nonetheless, such limitation is not required in Marathe which nowhere requires the exclusion of coupling to conductive channel. Applicant's not coupled to a conductive channel further is not associated with any explicit disclosure or any advantages; see the original disclosure [0018], [0019], wherein the dielectric layer 104 maybe on any suitable layer including a metallization stack. Note the absence of any explicit exclusion over a conductive channel now claimed or any advantages associated therewith, which applicant has failed to point out. See additionally, instant disclosure [0023] wherein any type of damascene interconnect can be made in dielectric layer, there is completely absence of any non-coupling to a conductive channel as now alleged or any associated alleged advantages and upon which patentability is sought. Furthermore, the employment of the damascene structure in Marathe having bottom portions over a conductive trench as well as having bottom portion not contacting a conductive trench, since such would permit the desired conventional structures as shown in Aoyama and Chen and permits contact to the lower trench where desired and permits isolation where

Art Unit: 2826

contact to a lower trench is not necessary, and such would permit both types of interconnect structures to be obtained using the same layers, inasmuch as applicant's own original disclosure fails to explicitly show such exclusion of coupling to a conductive channel and in fact evidences that such exclusion is nowhere required and no additional advantages is shown.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tuan Quach whose telephone number is 571-272-1717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Nathan Flynn, can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan Quach
Primary Examiner